DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 829 CG 014 425

AUTHOR Sengstock, Mary C.; Liang, Jersey
TITLE Attitudes of the Elderly toward the American Legal System.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.; National Retired Teachers Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the American Gerontological Association 32nd, Washington, DC, November 25-29, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Court Litigation; *Crime; Individual Characteristics; *Justice; Legal Responsibility; *Older Adults; Opinions; *Social Attitudes; State of the Art Reviews; Voluntary Agencies
IDENTIFIERS *Capital Punishment; *Victims

ABSTRACT

Courts have been set up primarily to deal with offenders and may not be responsive to the needs of victims of crime. Most research on the relationship of crime victims and courts focuses on the effects of victim characteristics upon the disposition of cases by the courts, the reactions which victims have had to their experiences with the law and courts, and proposed programs of assistance for victims. In order for advocacy programs for elderly victims to be effective, more information about the court problems of the elderly is needed. Three measures of attitudes toward the legal system appeared in the General Social Surveys conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (1972-1977): (1) belief that court sentences are not harsh enough; (2) belief that national expenditures to halt crime are insufficient; and (3) attitudes toward capital punishment. In general, older respondents favored harsher courts and capital punishment. Data on elderly attitudes toward expenditures was inconclusive. Factors other than age affecting respondents' attitudes are race, sex, marital status, family income, education, and size of city in which respondents lived. A study of the attitudes of elderly victims and non-victims showed no significant differences in their approval of defendants' rights. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186829

ATTITUDES OF THE ELDERLY TOWARD THE AMERICAN LEGAL SYSTEM

by

Mary C. Sengstock
and
Jersey Liang

Wayne State University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary C. Sengstock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 014425

Paper presented before the Gerontological Society, Washington, D.C., November, 1979. This research was supported by a grant from the AARP-NRTA Andrus Foundation.

The major avenue for redress of the injuries on the part of victims of crime has been the criminal courts. Increasingly, however, there has been the suggestion that the courts are not really responsive to the needs of victims (McDonald, 1976: 17-20). This is not really surprising, in view of the fact that the courts have been set up primarily to deal with offenders, and have been required to impose a number of procedures in order to assure thet the accused will receive a fair trial. However, the unfortunate result of this emphasis upon the accused has been to neglect the victim almost entirely.

As McDonald (1976:19) has pointed out, the offender is afforded a great deal of attention, by scholars and criminal justice personnel alike, and many services are available to help rehabilitate him. But for the victim there is pathetically little help. The defendent is guaranteed legal counsel, and if either the accused or his defense counsel is not present, the trial cannot occur. With regard to the victim, however, trials can, and often do begin without him, and sometimes the case may be dismissed or the offender allowed to plead guilty to a lesser charge, without the victim having the opportunity to express his views, or even be aware of the situation. The role which the victim plays in the courts is largely at the behest of the prosecutor. He may be called upon to testify, and if called, he must be available. However, if the prosecutor should decide he is not needed, or that a bargained plea is appropriate, then the victim is expendable. The victim is a good example of what Galanter (1977: 97-103, 109) has called a "One-Shot" participant in the legal system. And he notes that the "One Shotter" is at a great disadvantage in competing with the "Repeat Players", such as prosecutor, defense attorneys, and even the recidivist offender.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the position of the victim in the legal system has received little attention from social science researchers.

The few studies available consider three major aspects of the relationship of courts and victims: the effects of victim characteristics upon the disposition of cases by the courts, the reactions which victims have had to their experiences with the law and the courts; proposed programs of assistance for victims.

Victim Characteristics and Legal Outcomes

The effect of victim characteristics upon the outcome of court cases, especially those involving juries, was an early interest among sociologists of law. Broeder (1965) noted that the family status of plaintiffs in civil cases affected their likelihood of getting recovery in personal injury cases. More recently, Williams (1976: 177) studied court disposition of cases involving different types of victims. He analyzed the effect of victim characteristics on the decisions made at several different points in the legal process: the initial screening by the prosecutor, the pre-trial examination, the actual trial, and so on. The author found that a number of factors were useful in predicting the outcome of such cases. For example, the prestige of the victim was inversely related to the probability that charges would be dropped at an early stage (Williams, 1976: 178). A determination that the victim had provoked the offense also was likely to lead to a dropping of the charges (187-189). If any type of contributory fault could be assigned to the victim, the author found that it was likely to affect the outcome of a jury trial, and sometimes also of a trial by a judge (180-181). In fact, if any type of general culpability could be assigned to the victim (he was alcoholic, a drug addict, involved in illegal activity, et cetera), the author suggests that this was likely to produce a dismissal prior to the trial. A similar pattern is suggested by Jones (1977), who found that elderly residents of skid row were not likely to have their victimization taken seriously by the courts.

Williams (1976:179) concludes that criminal justice decision-makers

(prosecutors, judges, jurors) are attempting to fit the experience of victimization into a "just world theory". That is, they do not want to believe that criminal victimization occurs to an individual who is totally innocent. Rather, it occurs to people who are, in part, responsible for their own fate. People wish to believe, that the victim somehow deserved the misfortune which befell him. In contrast, the victim who is perceived as "weak" (e.g., the very young or the very old victim), who appears unlikely to have done anything to make him responsible for his own fate, was less likely to have his case dropped at an early point (Williams, 1976: 194-195). It is interesting to note, however, that the perception of the victim as weak had an effect upon the case only at this initial point. It did not affect the outcome of the case at later points.

To summarize then, it appears that the status of the victim does indeed have some effect upon the outcome of the legal process. Where the victim is attractive, respectible, or of high prestige, the case is less likely to be dropped. Where the victim is perceived as being blameworthy, either in a specific sense with regard to this particular crime, or in the general sense of being an unsavory character, the case is more likely to be dropped. Where a victim is viewed as weak, the case is more likely to be brought to the courts, but the outcome in court is not likely to be affected. We suggest that these diverse effects of victim characteristics may stem, in part, from the fact that the legal process itself involves a number of divergent dimensions, and legal system participants must accomplish a number of divergent goals. On the one hand, the prosecutor must appear to be protecting the "respectible citizen" and the weak; hence he cannot drop cases of persons who are very old, very young, or of high prestige. On the other hand, he must present a good case in court, and cannot, therefore, handle too many cases for persons who would make poor witnesses. In the case of many weak victims, such as children or the

elderly, these two propositions may conflict. On the one hand, the elderly victim presents a quite pathetic picture, misused as he is by a much stronger offender, and is clearly in need of protection and help. On the other hand, an elderly person may make a poor witness, in that he may have less alert senses, poor memory retention, or difficulty relating the facts. Hence these two sets of characteristics may work in opposition with regard to the likelihood of an elderly victim receiving adequate attention from the criminal justice system. Further research is necessary in order to determine with greater precision the manner in which elderly victims are dealt with by the courts.

Victim Reactions to the Court Experience

Another issue is the reaction of the victim to his experience in court. Does he/she feel that the treatment received was fair? Were there any serious problems presented by the necessity of appearing in the court? Knudten and his associates (1976: 115-130) analyzed the responses of a number of victims to their court experience, whether or not they were satisfied with the outcome, and what problems they had experienced. They found that most victims were relatively satisfied with their experience in the court (Knudten et al, 1976:118). Several problems were mentioned by the victims. Some were peripheral to the court itself, such as having to spend a great deal of time in the court, experiencing financial loss as a result of appearing in court, obtaining transportation to come to court. Other problems were intrinsic to the courtroom setting--meeting people who upset them, poor conditions in the waiting area, uncertainty about what to do in court, et cetera (Knudten et al, 1976: 123). While the researchers were not specifically concerned with the elderly, they present some breakdowns of the data by age. Victims aged 50 and over were most likely to mention the extended waiting time as a problem (124-125), and were almost unanimous in stating that transportation presented difficulties

(130). They suffered greater financial loss than many other victims, but were less likely to view this as a problem than other age groups (127-129). The elderly are less likely to mention being concerned with the problems encountered in the courtroom setting itself, such as where to go and what to do (129-130). Knudten (143), comparing the experiences of the various types of elderly victims, comments on the fact that there appear to be no significant differences between victims of different subgroups in their problems with the courts. If anything, he found that the elderly have fewer problems. He suggests, therefore, that the provision of victim services aimed at certain subgroups, such as the aged, is ill-advised. Rather services should be directed toward all victims, regardless of their ascriptive characteristics. This raises the more basic issue of the types of services which should be provided to victims.

Assistance Programs for Victims

Victim assistance programs cover a wide range. Some involve the routine provision of simple courtesies, such as more pleasant waiting rooms or information about court cases (McDonald, 1976:30; Sengstock, 1977). Others involve financial compensation for the injuries which victims have endured (Lamborn, 1979; Shafer, 1968: Chap. 3; McDonald, 1976: 37-38). Perhaps the most controversial are those which provide information and assistance to victims during the court process itself (McDonald, 1976: 32-36; DuBow and Becker, 1976). The goal of these programs is to obtain more favorable outcomes for victims in the court process, in the form of convictions, higher bail bonds, and more stringent sentences. Some programs accomplish these ends by hiring special attorneys, called victim advocates, who negotiate with police and prosecutors, accompany victims to court, explain the legal process, and even attempt to serve as private prosecutors (DuBow and Becker, 1976: 153-157); McDonald, 1976: 34-35). Others organize groups of supporters who accompany

victims to court, to provide moral support, as well as to indicate to the court that the problem of a given victim is not an isolated one, but one with broader social significance which should be dealt with in a more serious manner (DuBow and Becker, 1976: 152-153). Either of these victim advocacy approaches could well be employed by groups of elderly persons, or by neighborhoods with persons of varying ages, when they are faced with continuing problems of crime.

However, such victim advocacy approaches are by no means institutionalized in the courts, and many judges and prosecutors, especially defense attorneys are loathe to let them operate (DuBow and Becker, 1976; McDonald, 1976). It is not difficult to see why defense attorneys would oppose them, since their presence is designed to complicate their task of freeing their clients. What is less obvious is the reason for the opposition on the part of prosecutors, who might presumably welcome the assistance with their task. However, as McDonald (1976: 33) notes, "Prosecutors are not used to having their discretionary decisions about plea bargaining or other matters challenged..." He concludes that many prosecutors support so-called "victim assistance" programs primarily as a means of victim control, e.g., to assure that the prosecutor will be able to reach the victim and obtain his testimony, if and when it is needed (McDonald, 1976: 35).

Another controversial aspect of victim assistance concerns the nature of the target group. As McDonald (1976: 20-25) points out, several programs have been established which have specific target groups. Thus, there are special assistance programs for child victims, for elderly victims, and especially for victims of sex offenses. Some authorities, as we have already noted, believe that the needs of victims are universal, so assistance programs should be directed towards all victims (Knudten, 1976: 143). On the other hand, others advocate special attention to certain types of victims. Thus

Geis (1977: 9) believes that special attention should be given to the needs of weak victims, such as the elderly, even to the extent of imposing more stringent penalties upon offenders who have victimized the weak. This type of intrusion of victim characteristics into the legal process is likely to meet with the same type of objections on the part of judges, prosecutors, and attorneys for the defense, as the victim advocacy programs just discussed.

The outcome of a criminal court action provides only one type of assistance to the victim, in the form of a feeling of vindication that justice has been done. It is really the satisfaction of the desire for revenge. Since the criminal justice focuses primarily on the offender, this desire of the victim has been largely downplayed. It is often viewed as illegitimate. (Chambliss and Seidman, 1971: 200-201). However, as Mead (1918) and Durkheim (1938: 65-75) pointed out some time ago, societal satisfaction that the guilty have been punished is a primary and very important aspect of criminal process. (See also Shafer, 1968: 113-115).

One last aspect of the criminal process which deserves mention is the fact that many offenses committed against the elderly are committed by juvenile offenders, who are never brought before the criminal court. The Juvenile Courts, which handle such offenses have a very different process, in which private hearings replace a public trial, and the victim may never be called upon to present evidence (Empey, 1978: 456). Thus he has no opportunity to explain how he was victimized and the problems it caused for him. With the juvenile, even more than with adult offenders, the victim is likely to conclude that the legal system is not concerned with him or his problems.

One can only conclude that programs for the assistance of victims of crime, elderly or otherwise, are in a very rudimentary stage of development, and face a lorg difficult struggle for acceptance, particularly by participants

in the criminal justice system who are likely to resent any intrusion into their domain. While Knudten (1976: 143) may claim that such assistance should be aimed toward all victims, it is not likely that programs will be initiated on such a large scale. It appears much more feasible, we believe, that individual advocacy groups, championing the cause of one type of victim or another, will develop under the support of agencies devoted to the needs of that particular subgroup. Hence the immediate future probably portends a number of advocacy groups, one for elderly victims, another for victims of rape or domestic violence, etc. Eventually these may coalesce into a single group to respond to the needs of all victims.

If these programs are to be successful, then greater information about the court problems of the elderly is necessary. Research to date has tended to focus upon a few very specific and narrowly defined problems (Knudten, 1976). Little is known about their views of the courts regarding wider, more comprehensive issues. If the elderly are to be served adequately in their encounters with the courts, then such broader issues should be addressed. What are their perceptions of the role of the courts? Are they satisfied with court performance? What acts do they believe should be dealt with by the courts? And what procedures should be followed?

The present paper will attempt to analyze data concerning the attitudes of the elderly toward the courts. We will use data from data collected by the National Opinion Research Center in their General Social Surveys conducted in 1972 through 1977. We will also compare the responses of victims and non-victims, since it seems likely that the experience of victimization may affect an individual's attitudes towards the courts and their effectiveness. We will attempt to obtain further support for Knudten's (1976: 118) conclusion that victims are generally satisfied with the courts.

There are three measures of attitudes toward the legal system which appeared in the General Social Surveys conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1972 through 1977. These three measures included: belief that courts in the respondent's area were not harsh enough (as opposed to a belief that they were either too harsh or all right); belief that expenditures on a national level to halt crime were insufficient (as opposed to a belief that they were either sufficient or too much); and the attitude toward the most extreme crime control measure which can be used, namely capital punishment (dichotomized into those who approve versus those who disapprove). A multivariate logit model was developed for the general population for each variable and for each of the years in which the question was asked. In addition, a discriminant analysis was conducted using the elderly respondents only for each variable. The results should indicate the predictive variables for each attitude in the general population; we were especially interested in knowing whether age was a significant factor in predicting atitudes toward law and the courts. In general, we shall consider a variable to be a useful predictor if it bears a significant relationship to the dependent variable for at least three years. The special analysis of the elderly should indicate which categories of the elderly are more likely to hold certain views.

Turning first to attitudes toward the harshness of courts, four variables appeared to be significant predictors of a belief that courts are not harsh enough. One of these variables is age, which was a significant predictor in 1972, 73, and 76 (Table Ia). In general, older respondents were more likely to think that courts were not harsh enough. The same belief that courts should be more harsh was characteristic of married persons (1974, 75, 76), and of whites (1972, 73, 75). It is also true that, the higher the income, the more likely the respondent is to want the courts to be more harsh; lower income persons

believe they are harsh enough or say they do not know (true in 1972, 73, 75). All of these results are consistent with the general view of older persons, whites, and the married as being more conservative politically (Glenn, 1974: 181-182; Patchen, 1972: 456-467). In 1972, 75, and 76, residents of large cities were significantly more likely to think courts should be more harsh then were small town residents. This may be a reflection of the lesser seriousness of the crime problem in small communities, or it may indicate that small town courts are actually more harsh than their big city counterparts. However, it is important to note that a significant reversal of this pattern occurred in 1974, when small town respondents were more likely to think the courts needed to be more harsh. For our purposes, however, the importance of the age variable is paramount.

Turning to the data on the elderly alone, the results appeared to be somewhat the same but there is much less consistency (Table Ib). A belief that courts were not harsh enough appeared among elderly whites (72), high income persons (73, 74), males (74), and aged respondents in large cities (77). However, with none of these groups does the pattern appear a minimum of three years, and in only one case (income) does it appear more than one year. In contrast, Catholics (76), educated respondents (73), and those with prestige occupations (74) thought the courts were all right or too harsh. The results are too inconsistent to be of great predictive value, however.

The same inconsistency of pattern appears when we look at attitudes toward expenditures to halt crime (Table II a). Three variables exhibited significant results, but in all three cases, the patterns of one year are reversed in other years. Thus in 1974, older respondents thought that more money should be spent fighting crime; but in 1977, this same age group thought such expenditures were sufficient. If these are valid data, it might reflect a change in the attitude

of older persons. Similarly, in 1973 and 75, educated persons thought such expenditures were sufficient, but in 1977 this pattern reverses. Generally, high income persons thought expenditures to fight crime were sufficient (1973, 74, 77), possibly a reflection of their greater interest in governmental economy and their insulation from most crime, which affects the lower classes so heavily. However, here again the results are inconsistent; for in 1975 high income respondents sought greater expenditures to fight crime.

Results for the elderly alone are also inconclusive (Table II b). Whites (1974), large city dwellers (1974), educated persons (1975), and females (1976) were all significantly more likely to want greater expenditures to halt crime. But in no case did a specific pattern occur in more than a single year. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that for elderly respondents and for the population as a whole, age, sex, race, income, city size, education, and occupational prestige are not clear significant predictors of one's attitude toward the need for money to be spent on crime control.

Turning to the issue of capital punishment, the results are considerably more clear (Table III a). Age is one of the more significant factors, with older persons more likely to approve capital punishment in 1972, 73, 75, and 77. Whites were more likely to approve in 1972, 73, 74, 75, and 77. Also approving were the less educated (in 1973, 74, 75, 76, 77), and large city dwellers (in 1972, 73, 75, and 77). One is fairly safe in concluding, therefore, that the elderly, along with whites, the less educated, and city dwellers, are more favorable toward the death penalty. High income persons were also likely to approve, but this pattern appears in only two years (1973, 76). Again the pattern is generally what one might expect, since the aged, whites, and the uneducated generally tend to be more conservative. Some strange patterns appear here with regard to political preference, however. As might be expected,

Republicans, at the conservative end of the political spectrum, approved of capital punishment in 1974. But strangely, the supposedly more liberal Democrats were more likely to approve in both 1973 and 1975.

Among the elderly themselves, there is no consistent pattern which emerges over several years (Table III b). Whites (1976), the married (1975), and Roman Catholics (1974) indicated a greater tendency to voice approval, and Jews to express disapproval (1974). But again, each pattern appears only for a single year, allowing us little basis to make any firm conclusions.

A Final Note: Victims and the Legal System

As we noted earlier, Knudten found that victims were generally satisfied with the legal system. We had hoped to determine, using more broadly based data, whether victims were less favorably disposed toward the courts and the legal system than non-victims. Unfortunately, the General Social Surveys just discussed had too few aged victims for analysis. We turn now to data taken from the NORC victimization survey (Ellis, 1966), which included some questions about attitudes toward the legal system. Three specific measures will be used. Two relate to approval of specific Supreme Court decisions, one requiring that an attorney be present during questioning of a suspect; the other requiring that the state provide a defendant with an attorney at state expense. The third item is less an attitudinal item than a behavioral one, since it asked whether the respondent had a family lawyer.

We hypothesized that victims, having experienced the trauma of a crime, might be less supportive of legal assistance for the defendant than non-victims. A discriminant analysis was conducted on these two issues, with independent variables, as follows: victim/non-victim status, together with race, sex, age, marital status, family income, education, and size of city.

As Table IV shows, the hypothesis was not validated using either of the two measures of support for criminal defense. Victims were not significantly different from non-victims in their likelihood to approve of defendants' rights. Neither were any of the other factors significant predictors of attitudes on this issue.

Interesting differences do appear among the elderly in their likelihood to have a family attorney, however. As Table IV shows, males were significantly more likely than females to have an attorney they could call upon, a fact which is not surprising in view of males' greater likelihood to have business or financial interests which may call for an attorney's counsel. The surprising and sorry fact is that victims of crime are less likely to have an attorney they could call for help than persons who had not been victims. It is difficult to explain this fact. One is tempted to suggest that victims are poor or minorities, and therefore less likely to have access to an attorney. However, income and race do not appear as significant variables, so this is not likely to be a valid explanation. The consequence is clear, however: the aged victim is less likely to have a legal authority he/she can call upon for advice and support during the possible traumatic process of dealing with criminal victimization - calling the police, talking to prosecutors, and possibly testifying in court.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we can discern a fairly consistent pattern of predicting attitudes toward the legal system if attitudes toward the harshness of courts and toward capital punishment are used as the measures. On both issues, the elderly are rather clearly in favor of greater legal control, tending to side with a more harsh court, and one which might use capital punishment if it so

desired. Other factors predicting a tendency towards harsh measures were whites and large city dwellers. Also exhibiting such a pattern, but to a somewhat less consistent degree, were married persons and those with higher incomes. All of these data lend considerable support to the position of the radical criminologists that the criminal law is essentially a tool of the more powerful, established, and traditional leaders of the society over those lacking such advantages (Quinney, 1977; Chambliss, 1969).

TABLE Ia

MULTIVARIATE LOGIT MODEL OF BELIEF THAT COURTS ARE HARSH ENOUGH[a)]

(NORC General Social Survey)

Variables	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Demographic Variables:	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient
Age (Young to Old)[b)]	-.85836*	-.64726*	-.13390	-.12980	-.88093*	-.15052
Married	-.24835	.14806	-.46368*	-.49412*	-.40031*	-.18997
Male	-.24885	-.19574	.31605*	-.65750	.10597	.14153
White	-.48179*	-.36092*	.19379	-.40995*	-.13582	-.24990
Social Status Variables:						
Occupational Prestige (high to low)	.75153*	-.83800*	.80214	-.63091	.54452	.56735
Education (low to high)	.27525	.66280*	.21807	.49627*	.17321	.28921
Income (low to high)	-.36341*	-.38212*	-.11600	-.46157*	-.18274	-.62070
Subjective Social Class (low to high)	.92051	-.12409	-.95451*	.15856	-.12293	.13634
Other Variables:						
Size of City (large to small)	.92229*	.11188	-.82318*	.70242*	.66230*	.70037
Political Preference (Democrat to Republican)	-.68012*	-.80234*	-.46626	-.35885	-.22852	.27710

a) Dichotomized into: (low) courts are not harsh enough
(high) courts harsh enough or too harsh

b) Scale directions are given in parenthesis, with the low value listed first.

* Indicates coefficient is significant at 0.05 level or better

TABLE I b

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF BELIEF THAT COURTS ARE HARSH ENOUGH FOR ELDERLY RESPONDENTS (NORC General Social Survey)

Year		Variables	Standardized Discriminant Coefficients	F to Remove
1972:	Canonical	Male	0.41742	2.3453 n.s.
	Correlation: 0.345	White	0.71119	6.9160 **
	Group Centroids:	Protestant	0.51917	3.6020 n.s.
	not harsh enough=0.20771	Jew	-0.26806	1.0705 n.s.
	ok/too harsh= -0.64044	Political Preference	-0.33335	1.6766 n.s.
		City Size	-0.52685	3.6770 n.s.
		Occupational Prestige	-0.54456	2.7478 n.s.
		Education	-0.45240	2.2835 n.s.
1973:	Canonical	Catholic	0.48723	3.0637 n.s.
	Correlation:-0.305	Political Preference	0.43154	2.3655 n.s.
	Group Centroids:	Income	-0.78783	8.0223 **
	not harsh enough= -0.20723	Education	0.59189	4.4351 *
	ok/too harsh = 0.60165			
1974:	Canonical			
	Correlation: 0.4577107	Male	0.66402	6.6175 *
	Group Centroids:	City Size	0.49298	3.7560 n.s.
	not harsh enough=0.19213	Occupational Prestige	-0.73434	7.5812 **
	ok/too harsh = -1.34490	Income	0.67901	6.6022 *
1975:	Canonical	Jew	-0.36367	1.1675 n.s.
	Correlation: 0.2612884	Occupational Prestige	-0.47586	1.6611 n.s.
	Group Centroids:	Subjective Social Class	0.62262	3.1723 n.s.
	not harsh enough=-0.10408	Income	-0.54461	2.2527 n.s.
	ok/too harsh = 0.69384	Education	0.66063	3.0957 n.s.
1976:	Canonical	White	-0.31048	1.3389 n.s.
	Correlation: 0.2977139	Married	0.32119	1.5201 n.s.
	Group Centroids:	Catholic	-0.67145	6.4198 *
	not harsh enough=0.12242	Political Preference	0.29762	1.2885 n.s.
	ok/too harsh =-0.78551	City Size	-0.31705	1.3809 n.s.
		Education	0.31246	1.4324 n.s.
1977:	Canonical			
	Correlation: 0.3463372	Married	0.34896	1.6583 n.s.
	Group Centroid:	Political Preference	0.30552	1.4320 n.s.
	not harsh enough=0.13851	City Size	-0.78077	9.4545 **
	ok/too harsh = -0.96957	Occupational Prestige	0.43124	2.6039 n.s.
		Subjective Social Class	-0.42420	2.4356 n.s.
		Income	0.35015	1.6372 n.s.

19

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

n.s. not significant

TABLE IIa

MULTIVARIATE LOGIT MODEL OF BELIEF THAT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ON CRIME ARE NOT INSUFFICIENT[a)]
(NORC General Social Survey)

Variables:	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Demographic Variables:	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient
Age (Young to Old)		-.37918	-.56308*	-.42299	.28162	.62826*
Married		-.38261	.70308	-.12671	-.12459	-.22396
Male		.27718	.95289	.12077	.18162	.17162
White		.17349	.23979	-.95468*	.14569	.33935
Social Status Variables:						
Occupation Prestige (high to low)		-.28980	.26837	-.24550	-.29017	.18125
Education (low to high)		.61158*	.13406	.68960*	.28531	-.96078*
Income (low to high)		.60153*	.45833*	-.29587*	-.24771	.87222*
Subjective Social Class (low to high)		-.45824	.18441	.10952	.49488	-.82125
Other Variables:						
Size of City (large to small)		.45799*	.29767	.35195	.27494	-.11262
Political Preference (Democrat to Republican)		.30398	-.11518	.22266	-.82098*	.55447*

a) Dichotomized into: (low) expenditures on crime are insufficient
(high) expenditures of crime are sufficient or too much

b) Scale directions are given in parentheses, with the low value listed first.

* Indicates coefficient is significant at 0.05 level or better

Table II b

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF BELIEF THAT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ON CRIME ARE NOT INSUFFICIENT

(NORC GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY)

Year		Variables	Standarized Discriminant Coefficients	F to Remove
1974:	Canonical Correlation: 0.3340670	White	0.56878	4.1512 *
		Married	-0.35993	1.6304 n.s.
		Protestant	0.53971	3.5211 n.s.
	Group centroids:	Political Preference	-0.32107	1.3967 n.s.
	not enough=0.21237	City Size	-0.69376	5.7046 *
	Ok/too much= -0.58249	Income	0.40405	1.9842 n.s.
1975:	Canonical Correlation: 0.1923035	Occupational Prestige	-0.73525	2.1612 n.s.
		Education	1.01078	4.1489 *
	Group Centroids:			
	not enough=0.12465			
	Ok/too much= -0.30321			
1976:	Canonical Correlation: 0.3183056	Male	-0.86225	8.7718 **
		White	-0.49987	3.6869 n.s.
		Married	0.40743	2.0025 n.s.
	Group Centroids:	Jew	0.44052	2.8599 n.s.
	Not enough= 0.24802	City Size	-0.34836	1.7424 n.s.
	Ok/too much= -.044899	Subjective Social Class	-0.32464	1.5634 n.s.

* p< .05
** p< .01
*** p< .001
n.s. not significant

TABLE IIIa

MULTIVARIATE LOGIT MODEL OF OPPOSITION TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT[a)]

(NORC General Social Survey)

Variables:	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Demographic Variables:	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient	Logit Coefficient
Age (Young and Old)[b)]	-.76730*	-.89691*	-.32161	-.50097*	-.4061	-.73220*
Married	-.21150	-.93914	-.26260	-.11483	-.94968	-.12085
Male	-.29471	-.32014	-.15547	-.24342	-.31458	-.24340
White	-.73574*	-.57966*	-.51545*	-.80185*	-.66852	-.59692*
Social Status Variables:						
Occupational Prestige (high to low)	.27634	.29844	.20139	-.15692	.13587	.26433
Education (low to high)	-.21816	.48100*	.38521*	.62434*	.55682*	.91025*
Income (low to high)	.29410	-.39431*	.19840	-.24571	-.65725*	-.26425
Subjective Social Class (low to high)	.80628	.29087	.30059	-.10000	-.10828	.68375
Other Variables:						
Size of City (large to small)	.54121*	.92161*	.30043	.50928*	.11804	.78447*
Political Preference (Democrat to Republican)	-.31355	.52349*	-.65292*	.45603*	-.24135	.22347

a) Dichotomized into: (low) Approve capital punishment
(high) Oppose capital punishment

b) Scale directions are given in parentheses, with the low value listed first.

* Indicates coefficient is significant at 0.05 level or better

TABLE III b

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF SUPPORT FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR ELDERLY RESPONDENTS

(NORC GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY)

Year	Variables	Standardized Discriminant Coefficient	F to Remove
1974: Canonical Correlation: 0.369947	Male	0.30546	1.7109 n.s.
	White	0.41458	3.2051 n.s.
	Catholic	0.54523	5.4631 *
Group centriods:	Jew	-0.52976	5.2843 *
approve = 0.28858	Political Preference	0.44705	3.5942 n.s.
disapprove/ = -0.54182			
don't know			
1975: Canonical Correlation: 0.3647802	Married	-0.67516	7.2895 **
	Catholic	-0.38441	2.4883 n.s.
	Political Preference	-0.36988	2.1407 n.s.
Group centroids:	City Size	0.32459	1.6143 n.s.
approve= -0.27951	Income	-0.37476	1.9897 n.s.
disapprove/dk = 0.54118	Education	0.45259	3.1632 n.s.
1976: Canonical Correlation: 0.2705831	Male	0.42249	2.1435 n.s.
	White	0.83890	8.1403 **
	Protestant	-0.63452	1.2644 n.s.
Group Centroids	Catholic	-0.93660	2.8763 n.s.
approve = 0.20267	City Size	-0.35589	1.3801 n.s.
disapprove/dk = -0.38540			

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$
n.s. not significant

TABLE IV

Attitudes of the Elderly - - Victims and Non-Victims - -
Toward Aspects of the Legal System

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function	F to remove
Support for Lawyer Present			
Canonical Correlation: 0.1468668	Education	-0.57080	3.3227 ns
	White	-0.59453	3.6013 ns
	Size of City (low=large city)	0.36911	1.4740 ns
Group Centroids: Favor 0.15883 Oppose, DK -0.13824			
Support for Free Attorney			
Canonical Correlation: 0.0791054	Male	0.82146	2.1234 ns
	Education	0.58969	1.0920 ns
Group Centroids: Favor 0.03643 Oppose, DK -0.17219			
Have Family Attorney			
Canonical Correlation: 0.1972128	Male	-0.32396	8.0467 **
	Victim	0.46817	4.0270 *
	Education	-0.32733	1.8365 ns
Group Centroids: Yes -0.13838 No 0.29128	Family Income	-0.32396	1.7005 ns
	Size of City (low=large)	-0.23127	1.0211 ns

* p <.05
** p <.01
*** p <.001
ns: not significant

Variables in the Analysis:
Race, Sex, Age, Marital Status, Family Income, Education, Size of City, Victim/Non-Victim Status.

Bibliography

Broeder, Dale, 1965.
"Plaintiff's Family Status as Affecting Juror Behavior: Some Tentative Insights." In Journal of Public Law. 14: 131-141.

Chambliss, William J. (ed), 1969.
Crime and the Legal Process. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chambliss, William J. and Robert B. Seidman, 1971.
Law, Order and Power. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

DuBow, Frederic L. and Theodore M. Becker, 1976.
"Patterns of Victim Advocacy." In William F. McDonald, Editor. Criminal Justice and the Victim. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Durkheim, Emile, 1938.
The Rules of Sociological Method. 8th edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Empey, LaMar T., 1978.
American Delinquency. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey.

Galanter, Gilbert, 1977.
"Why the 'Haves' Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change." In Law and Society. 9:95-160, Fall.

Glenn, Norval D., 1974.
"Aging and Conservatism." In Richard D. Lambert, Editor; Alan W. Heston, Assistant Editor; Frederick Eisele, Special Editor. The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Knudten, Richard D.; Anthony Meade; Mary Knudten and William Doerner, 1976.
"The Victim in the Administration of Criinal Justice: Problems and Perceptions." In William F. McDonald, Editor. Criminal Justice and the Victim." Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lamborn, Leroy L., 1979.
"Reparations for Victims of Crimes: Developments and Directions." Forthcoming in Victimology.

McDonald, William F., 1976.
"Criminal Justice and the Victim." In William F. McDonald, Editor. Criminal Justice and the Victim. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing.

Mead, George Herbert, 1918.
"The Psychology of Punitive Justice." American Journal of Sociology. March.

Patchen, Martin, 1972.
"Social Class and Dimensions of Foreign Policy Attitudes." In Dan D. Nimmo and Charles M. Bonjean, Editors. Political Attitudes and Public Opinion. New York: David MacKay C., Inc.

Quinney, Richard, 1977.
Class, State and Crime. New York: Longman.

Sengstock, Mary C., 1977.
"Initial Impressions of an Assistance Program for Victims and Witnesses in a Criminal Court." Mimeographed.

Shafer, Stephen, 1968.
The Victim and His Criminal. New York: Random House.

Williams, Kristen M., 1976.
"The Effects of Victim Characteristics on the Disposition of Violent Crime." In William F. McDonald, Editor. Criminal Justice and the Victim. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.